

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Daniel Archie Jones,)	C/A No. 1:09-2670-JFA-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Samuel B. Glover, Director of the South)	
Carolina Department of Probation, Parole,)	
and Pardon Services; Henry McMaster,)	
Attorney General of the State of South)	
Carolina; and Kernard Redmond, Deputy)	
Solicitor of Dillon County, sued in their)	
individual capacities,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The *pro se* plaintiff, Daniel Archie Jones, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of his constitutional and due process rights in relation to the application of a 1994 state sex offender registry law to plaintiff's 1985 conviction for kidnapping. He seeks monetary and declaratory relief.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation and opines that complaint fails to state a claim, and thus, the defendants'

¹ The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

motion to dismiss² should be granted. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.


The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation which was entered on the docket on January 12, 2011. However, the plaintiff failed to file objections. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report and Recommendation, this court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. The Report is incorporated herein by reference.

Accordingly, the defendants' motions to dismiss (ECF Nos. 15 and 28) are granted, and plaintiff's motions to amend (ECF No. 24) and for summary judgment (ECF. No. 32) are denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February 7, 2011
Columbia, South Carolina


Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge

² An order was issued pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) notifying plaintiff of the summary dismissal procedure and possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond to the motion to dismiss or for summary judgment. Plaintiff did not respond to the motion.